

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing amendment Claims 1-14 are pending, Claims 4-6 and 10-12 being currently withdrawn. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended and Claims 13-14 have been added by the present amendment. Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be found at least in Figure 3B. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0011605 to Distefano et al. (hereinafter “Distefano”); Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Distefano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,245,674 to Sandhu (hereinafter “Sandhu”); Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0020985 to Hinata (hereinafter “Hinata”) in view of Distefano; and Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Distefano and Sandhu.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a multilayer wired board including at least part of an electrical circuit board in which a plurality of wired boards are stacked so as to face their wired surfaces toward each other. The multilayer board includes electrical connection parts between the multilayer wired boards which are connected through an elastic conductive material part adhered to one of the wired boards. A double-sided adhesive material part is provided between the plurality of wired boards to adhere them together. An opening is formed in the double-sided adhesive material part, surrounding at least part of a peripheral edge portion of the elastic conductive material part, sealing the plurality of multilayer wired

boards. The elastic conductive material part is confined in diameter within the opening in the double-sided adhesive material part.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Distefano, Distefano is directed to an electrical connection with inwardly deformable contacts (75). In particular, Distefano describes that the peripheral portion of the contacts (75) have circumferences larger than the diameter of the holes, so that the peripheral portions engage the contact pads around the holes¹. Distefano further describes that compliant layers, having an adhesive, permit the peripheral portion of the contact (75) to deform in a downward direction toward the body wherein the compliant layer yields in response to the bending of the peripheral portion toward the body². However, Applicants respectfully submit that Distefano fails to disclose a multilayer wired board wherein an elastic conductive material part is confined in diameter within an opening of the double-sided adhesive material parts as recited in amended Claim 1. Rather, Distefano describes that the alleged elastic conductive material part has a diameter that is larger than the diameter of the hole³. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 1 (and dependent Claim 2) as anticipated by Distefano.

Claim 3 depends from Claim 1. Furthermore, the deficiencies of Distefano are not remedied by Sandhu cited in the grounds for rejection under 35 USC § 103(a). Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 3 as being unpatentable over Distefano in view of Sandhu.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Distefano, the deficiencies of Hinata are not remedied by Distefano cited in the grounds for rejection. Amended Claim 7 recites limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claim 7 has been amended in a manner analogous

¹ See paragraph 69

² See Figure 3, paragraphs 70 and 73

³ See paragraph 69

to the amendments to Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 7 as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Distefano.

Claim 9 depends from Claim 7. Furthermore, the deficiencies of Hinata and Distefano are not remedied by Sandhu cited in the grounds for rejection under 35 USC § 103(a). Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 7, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 9 as being unpatentable over Hinata in view of Distefano and Sandhu.

The present amendment also sets forth new Claims 13-14 for examination on the merits. New Claims 13 and 14, which depend from Claims 1 and 7 respectively, recite that said elastic conductive material part does not contact said double-sided adhesive material part. Applicants note that this more detailed feature of the claimed advancements is not disclosed or suggested by the art of record.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Scott A. McKeown
Registration No. 42,866

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)